DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 156 EA 022 907

AUTHOR Richardson, M. D.; And Others
TITLE The Kentucky Supervisor: A Research Profile.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 42p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Improvement; *Instructional Leadership; Leadership Responsibility; *School Supervision; *Supervisors; Supervisory Training; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS Kentucky

ABSTRACT

With the advent of educational reform, the functions of educational supervisors have changed dramatically. Supervision is a long-term, continuous process designed to assist teachers in providing learning opportunities for students and improve the instructional program. Teachers constantly report that they receive their primary help from other teachers and are highly critical of the amount and quality of assistance they receive from instructional leaders. The Kentucky Supervisor's Questionnaire (KAQ) was administered to the total population (184) of the state's instructional supervisors to develop a demographic profile. The 104 respondents viewed lack of time as a serious impediment to effective supervising and were basically satisfied with both inservice training and current certification standards. Recommendations included defining the role of instructional supervisor more carefully and getting started with preparing the next generation of supervisors immediately. Demographic data are provided in 27 tables. (15 references) (EJS)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED331156

# THE KENTUCKY SUPERVISOR:

# A RESEARCH PROFILE

M. D. RICHARDSON
J. L. FLANIGAN
R. L. PRICKETT
M. H. SIMS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Mike Richardson** is Associate Professor of Educational Administration and **Jack Flanigan** is Associate Professor and Coordinator of Educational Administration, both at **Clemson University**, Clemson, SC 29634 (803-656-3482). **Robert Prickett** is Associate Professor and Coordinator of Educational Administration at **Western Kentucky University**, Bowling Green, KY 42101 (502-745-4890). **Margaret Sims** is a graduate student at **Western Kentucky University.**

EA 022 907

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Richardson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

School systems typically have on their staff persons listed as "instructional supervisors" who have as their primary responsibility the professional development of teachers. However, with the advent of the effective schools movement and educational reform, the functions of supervisors have changed dramatically.

Many supervisors have additional duties and responsibilities assigned by the superintendent and have been asked to complete more tasks and be competent in more areas than ever before. School systems perceive and utilize instructional supervisors in varied ways. In some systems, for example, supervisors take on tasks which include textbook selection and inventory, curriculum handbook writer, liaison to different committees in the school system, and tragically sometimes a "go for."

**BACKGROUND**

A database or demographic profile regarding the instructional supervisors in the Commonwealth of Kentucky did not exist. The researchers consolidated information from available sources to develop a questionnaire. The questionnaire was then administered to two separate graduate educational leadership classes at Western Kentucky University to field test the instrument. The resulting

instrument, the Kentucky Supervisor's Questionnaire (KAQ) was administered to the total population (184) of instructional supervisors in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

## SUPERVISION

Supervision has been defined in a myraid of terms by various researchers. Probably the most succinct definition would be: supervision is a process designed to assist teachers in providing learning opportunities for students. The supervisor's goal is both long-term and short-term in nature. Teachers need assistance in solving immediate problems, but they also need the support of supervisors as they cooperatively search for ways to improve teaching and learning. Clearly, supervision is a long-term, continuous process that requires cooperation from all parties concerned; teachers, supervisors, and administrators.

The purpose of supervision is the improvement of the instructional program. Efficient supervisors possess three kinds of skills: human, managerial, and technical (Katz, 1955). Mann (1965) restated Katz's work and described three classifications of supervisory skills as human, technical, and administrative or managerial. He further stated that the mix of these skills is the key to supervisory competence.

According to Mann (1965), technical skill is defined as the specialized knowledge and ability required to perform

the primary tasks that are required in a supervisory position. Human relation skills involve the ability to work with people and to motivate them so they will desire to do their best. The administrative or managerial skill refers to the ability to make decisions and see relationships that are important to the organization to which the supervisor is responsible. The supervisory mix concept is applicable to any educational organization even though different skills are required at different levels (Alfonso, Firth, & Neville, 1984).

Alfonso, Firth & Neville (1984) postulate that a major deterrent to the full professional status of educational supervisors is the lack of an agreed-upon set of professional skills as well as an ill-defined knowledge base. Most skills used by supervisors are those acquired on the job rather than from and/or during professional preparation.

Teachers constantly report that they receive their primary help from other teachers (Alfonzo & Goldsberry, 1982) and they are highly critical of the amount and quality of assistance they receive from their instructional leaders. (Alfonso, Firth, & Neville, 1981). Consequently, teachers are often forced to seek assistance elsewhere when their local instructional supervisor(s) lacks the skills directly related to the work of classroom teachers. Whether supervisors are actually deficient in such skills or only perceived in that light by teachers, the results are the

same. Because of this, supervision is frequently seen as unrelated to the improvement of instruction (Reyes, 1986). Occasional visits by an instructional supervisor to individual classrooms continues to emphasize for teachers that the main function of supervision is administrative monitoring (Alfonso, Firth & Neville 1984).

The supervisor's most essential task is his/her responsibility for improving instruction (Cogan, 1973). Supervisors are expected to perform the duties of being "instructional experts, diagnosticians, curriculum developers, instructional planners, problem solvers, innovators, clinical observation specialists, and managers of the processes of teaching and learning" (Alfonso, Firth & Neville 1984, p. 17). Goldsberry (1984) states that the primary function of supervisors is to help teachers refine classroom practices through direct observation and conference. Supervisors can help improve teaching by supplementing classroom observations with analysis of the learning materials teachers use (McGreal, Broderick, & Jones, 1984)

Acheson and Gall (1987) emphasized that with all the supervisor's duties little time was allocated for observing teachers. In addition to the number of teachers to be supervised, the supervisor is left with observations resembling a Polaroid picture -- a single perspective, frozen in time, often posed, and only seemingly objective. In actual fact, the picture is actually dependent upon the

photographer (supervisor's) ability to capture the relevant situation, not the superficial (Dunkleberger, 1982).

Supervisors may visit any classroom, but they must be psychologically accepted by the teacher if the process is to be anything more than a ritual. Most teachers desire to improve their skills -- to be better teachers (Glickman & Gordon, 1987). Supervisors can help teachers increase mastery of teaching which leads to a confirmation of the teachers's self-worth. By helping teachers to become better, supervisors help teachers to become more motivated. Teachers who are concerned with high-quality performance tend to have a deep emotional and intellectual stake in what they do, resulting in fear of change. Therefore, any changes advocated by the supervisor should fit an individual teachers' belief system about good teaching (June, Wenger, & Guetti, 1987). The supervisor should provide services to the necessary extent that the teacher will invite the supervisor willingly into the classroom (Blumberg & Jonas, 1987).

## METHODOLOGY

The Kentucky Supervisor's Questionnaire was mailed on March 14, 1989, to the 184 instructional supervisors in the Commonwealth of Kentucky who were identified from records of the Kentucky State Department of Education. Included in the mailing were the following: a questionnaire, a cover letter, and a business reply envelop for return of the

questionnaire. Of the 184 questionnaires mailed, 104 were returned for a 56.9 percent response.

## FINDINGS

The mean age of the responding instructional supervisor in Kentucky was 47 years of age. More than half, 56.56 percent, of the respondents were between 40 and 50 years of age. This figure was consistent with similar studies of principals in Kentucky (Richardson, Cline, & Flanigan, 1988) and Tennessee, (Richardson, 1986).

Surprisingly, almost half of the respondents 46.05 percent, were female. This was not consistent with similar studies of educational administrators. Also surprising was the marital status of the respondents with only 84 percent married which was considerably less than similar studies of principals.

Almost all (99%) of the respondents were white. Again, this was unexpected considering the percent of minority educational administrators in the Commonwealth, particularly in Jefferson County.

Almost three-fourths, 72.82 percent, of the respondents were responsible for supervision from kindergarten through grade 12. This was consistent with the typical rural population and small school districts in Kentucky which have only one supervisor. With over 170 school districts and only 184 identified instructional supervisors, the

predominant role of the supervisor was expected to be K-12.

Respondents reported employment as a supervisor in the current school system for a mean of 10.27 years, with 48 percent reporting employment for nine years or less. Supervisors did not exhibit mobility as there was so little difference in the years of total experience versus years in the current system. However, with the predominant pattern of one supervisor per district, mobility would almost be restricted to movement between school systems rather than within school systems.

Respondents reported a mean salary of $39,673 with almost three-fourths, 73.67 percent, reporting a salary between $36,000 and $44,000. Only two respondents had a salary over $50,000, and only one had a salary of less than $32,000. The wide discrepancy in salaries was attributable to training, years of experience, and local contribution to salary. Similarly, most respondents, 91.10 percent, reported working twelve months to earn the salary. The mean number of months worked was 11.89. An overwhelming percentage, 98.04 percent, also reported having a job description.

The largest percentage of respondents, 25.24 percent, obtained their bachelor's degree from a private college or university located in Kentucky. The figures should have some serious implications for state universities when one-fourth of all the instructional supervisors attended a private college in the Commonwealth.

The largest number of respondents, 29.13 percent, obtained their master's degree from Western Kentucky University. Eastern Kentucky University was next with 20.39 percent, followed by those trained out-of-state with 18.45 percent of the respondents. Western Kentucky University also trained the largest number of instructional supervisors who held either an education specialist degree or rank I certification with 30.75 percent of the respondents. Next was Eastern Kentucky University and Murray State University, both with 14.29 percent. Additionally, only six respondents reported holding a doctorate with only two of those being obtained in Kentucky, one each from the University of Louisville and the University of Kentucky, and the remainder being obtained outside the state.

Respondents were basically satisfied with both in-service training and current certification standards. Slightly more than 15 percent expressed dissatisfaction. Considering the problems experienced with current administrative certification programs, the lack of dissatisfaction was surprising. However, most of these supervisors would not be affected since they have been in their current positions for several years on the average.

The respondents were almost equally divided in their opinion of merit pay for administrators. This figure is reflective of the national uncertainty about the proposal.

Respondents believed that the major constraints affecting their effectiveness were "too many

responsibilities", 22.64 percent, and "time" (or lack there of), 20.75 percent. The reference to time is almost universal among educational administrators. However, the implication of the "many responsibilities" are numerous. Obviously, instructional supervisors perceive that they wear too many hats and are pulled in too many directions. They believe this lack of consistency impedes their success in their primary role, supervision. In many smaller districts the instructional supervisor is all things, from the assistant superintendent to the director of special projects and all those functions in between.

Most respondents had been a principal (33.33 percent) or a classroom teacher (40.96 percent) immediately before assuming the supervisors role. Obviously, many supervisors were selected based on their outstanding performance in the classroom. The evidence is not so clear with reference to principals; some could have been promoted based on either outstanding performance or lack of permanence. Most respondents, 98.10 percent, were supervisors in public school systems.

Of the respondents, 45.10 percent plan to retire in the next five years, and 84.54 percent plan to retire in the next ten years (Richardson, Cline, & Flanigan, 1988). This is considerably more than the retirement projections for the principalship where approximately 60 percent plan to retire in the next ten years.

Most of the respondents belong to numerous professional organizations, with KASA and KAES being the most popular. Most belong to state organizations but not national organizations.

Respondents reported that the primary reason they entered supervision was to "make educational improvements" (24.27 percent). Their secondary reason was to "improve academic performance" (25.26 percent). Their tertiary reason was their "desire for leadership" (21.51 percent). Although "income" received high marks, most respondents listed personal achievement goals rather than monetary gain as the reason for entering instructional supervision. This is supported by most national studies examining the motivation of educators.

Most respondents, 35.30 percent, worked 50 to 54 hours per week and worked in a small (2,000 to 2,999 students) school district, 26.73 percent.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Clearly, the role of instructional supervisor should be more carefully defined.
2. This is a concern that needs to be addressed. Are most of the best and brightest going outside the state for training? If so, are they returning to Kentucky, or are they permanently lost to other states?

3. If almost 85 percent plan to retire within the next ten years, colleges and universities should become busy preparing the next generation of instructional supervisors.
4. Since almost 25% of the respondents obtained their initial degree from a private institution, public four-year institutions in Kentucky should carefully examine this phenomena which has serious implications for public institutions in the Commonwealth.
5. The data presented suggests the needs for further study of instructional supervisors.

## CONCLUSIONS

The findings present evidence to substantiate certain logical conclusions. Based on a thorough analysis of the data in this study, the following conclusions were reached:

1. Lack of time was viewed as a serious impediment to the effectiveness of the instructional supervisor.
2. Most supervisors will be retiring during the next decade.
3. Almost one-fourth of the supervisors obtained their initial degree from a private institution in Kentucky.
5. Supervisors were basically satisfied with both in-service training and current certification

practices.

4. Supervisors worked long hours typically in small school districts.
5. Supervisors were almost all white; few minorities were evident.
6. The gender of supervisors was almost equally divided between male and female.
7. Supervisors were initially selected from either the classroom or the principalship.

TABLE I

AGE OF RESPONDENTS

| AGE | | N | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 60+ | | 6 | 6.06 |
| 55-59 | | 12 | 12.12 |
| 50-54 | | 18 | 18.18 |
| 45-49 | | 28 | 28.28 |
| 40-44 | | 28 | 28.28 |
| 35-39 | | 7 | 7.08 |
| **TOTALS** | $\bar{x}$=47 | **99** | **100.00** |

TABLE II

GENDER OF RESPONDENTS

| GENDER | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Male | 55 | 53.92 |
| Female | 47 | 46.08 |
| TOTALS | 102 | 100.00 |

TABLE III

MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

| MARITAL STATUS | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Single | 6 | 6.00 |
| Married | 84 | 84.00 |
| Divorced | 7 | 7.00 |
| Widowed | 3 | 3.00 |
| **TOTALS** | **100** | **100.00** |

TABLE IV

RACE OF RESPONDENTS

| RACE | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| White | 101 | 99.02 |
| Black | 1 | .98 |
| TOTALS | 102 | 100.00 |

TABLE V

SUPERVISION ROLE PLAYED BY RESPONDENTS

| ROLE | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| K-4 Supervision | 1 | 0.97 |
| K-6 Supervision | 5 | 4.85 |
| K-8 Supervision | 6 | 5.83 |
| K-12 Supervision | 75 | 72.82 |
| 5-8 Supervision | 0 | 0.00 |
| 7-12 Supervision | 7 | 6.80 |
| 9-12 Supervision | 4 | 3.88 |
| Other | | |
| 4-8 Supervision | 3 | 2.91 |
| 4-6 Supervision | 1 | 0.97 |
| 6-12 Supervision | 1 | 0.97 |
| **TOTALS** | **103** | **100.00** |

TABLE VI

RESPONDENTS YEARS AS SUPERVISOR
IN CURRENT SYSTEM

| YEARS | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| 25+ | 4 | 4.00 |
| 20-24 | 9 | 9.00 |
| 15-19 | 12 | 12.00 |
| 10-14 | 27 | 27.00 |
| 5-9 | 23 | 23.00 |
| 0-4 | 25 | 25.00 |
| TOTALS | 100 | 100.00 |

$\bar{x}$ = 10.37

TABLE VII

SALARY OF RESPONDENTS

| SALARY RANGE | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| $50,000 and over | 2 | 2.11 |
| $48,000 to $50,000 | 1 | 1.05 |
| $46,000 to $48,000 | 6 | 6.32 |
| $44,000 to $46,000 | 6 | 6.32 |
| $42,000 to $44,000 | 17 | 17.89 |
| $40,000 to $42,000 | 15 | 15.79 |
| $38,000 to $40,000 | 16 | 16.84 |
| $36,000 to $38,000 | 22 | 23.15 |
| $34,000 to $36,000 | 3 | 3.16 |
| $32,000 to $34,000 | 6 | 6.32 |
| $30,000 to $32,000 | 1 | 1.05 |
| TOTALS $\bar{x}$=$39,673 | 95 | 100.00 |

TABLE VIII

MONTHS USED TO DETERMINE
SALARY OF RESPONDENTS

| MONTHS | | N | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12 | | 91 | 90.10 |
| 11.50 | | 3 | 2.97 |
| 11.00 | | 3 | 2.97 |
| 10.50 | | 2 | 1.98 |
| 10.00 | | 2 | 1.98 |
| **TOTALS** | $\bar{x}$=11.89 | 101 | 100.00 |

TABLE IX

JOB DESCRIPTION OF RESPONDENTS

| JOB DESCRIPTION | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 100 | 98.04 |
| No | 2 | 1.96 |
| **TOTALS** | **102** | **100.00** |

TABLE X

RESPONDENT'S TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS AS SUPERVISOR

| YEARS | | N | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 25+ | | 5 | 5.00 |
| 20-24 | | 9 | 9.00 |
| 15-19 | | 11 | 11.00 |
| 10-14 | | 32 | 32.00 |
| 5-9 | | 23 | 23.00 |
| 0-4 | | 20 | 20.00 |
| **TOTALS** | $\bar{x}$=11.01 | **100** | **100.00** |

TABLE XI

COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES GRANTING BACHELOR'S DEGREES TO RESPONDENTS

| INSTITUTIONS | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Eastern Kentucky | 20 | 19.42 |
| Kentucky State | 0 | 0.00 |
| Morehead State | 10 | 9.71 |
| Murray State | 7 | 6.80 |
| Northern Kentucky | 1 | 0.97 |
| University of Kentucky | 9 | 8.74 |
| University of Louisville | 1 | 0.97 |
| Western Kentucky University | 14 | 13.59 |
| Other in-state | 26 | 25.24 |
| Out-of-state | 15 | 14.56 |
| **TOTALS** | **103** | **100.00** |

TABLE XII

COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES GRANTING
MASTER'S DEGREES TO RESPONDENTS

| INSTITUTIONS | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Eastern Kentucky | 21 | 20.39 |
| Kentucky State | 0 | 0.00 |
| Morehead State | 12 | 11.65 |
| Murray State | 12 | 11.65 |
| Northern Kentucky | 1 | 0.97 |
| University of Kentucky | 3 | 2.91 |
| University of Louisville | 1 | 0.97 |
| Western Kentucky University | 30 | 29.13 |
| Other in-state | 4 | 3.88 |
| Out-of-state | 19 | 18.45 |
| **TOTALS** | **103** | **100.00** |

TABLE XIII

COLLEGES/UNIVERSITIES GRANTING
ED.S. OR CERTIFICATION

| INSTITUTIONS | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Eastern Kentucky | 21 | 23.08 |
| Kentucky State | 0 | 0.00 |
| Morehead State | 13 | 14.29 |
| Murray State | 13 | 14.29 |
| Northern Kentucky | 1 | 1.10 |
| University of Kentucky | 3 | 3.30 |
| University of Louisville | 2 | 2.20 |
| Western Kentucky University | 28 | 30.75 |
| Other in-state | 1 | 1.10 |
| Out-of-state | | |
| Austin Peay, TN | 1 | 1.10 |
| Xavier, OH | 6 | 6.59 |
| University of AL | 1 | 1.10 |
| University of Cincinnati | 1 | 1.10 |
| TOTALS | 91 | 100.00 |

TABLE XIV

SATISFACTION REGARDING IN-SERVICE
BY RESPONDENTS

| IN-SERVICE RATING | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Entirely satisfactory | 5 | 5.00 |
| Mostly satisfactory | 49 | 49.00 |
| Equally satisfactory/ unsatisfactory | 31 | 31.00 |
| Mostly satisfactory | 12 | 12.00 |
| Entirely unsatisfactory | 3 | 3.00 |
| **TOTALS** | **100** | **100.00** |

TABLE XV

SATISFACTION REGARDING CERTIFICATION
STANDARDS BY RESPONDENTS

| CERTIFICATION | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Entirely satisfactory | 7 | 6.86 |
| Mostly satisfactory | 64 | 62.74 |
| Equally satisfactory/ unsatisfactory | 15 | 14.71 |
| Mostly unsatisfactory | 14 | 13.73 |
| Entirely unsatisfactory | 2 | 1.96 |
| **TOTALS** | **102** | **100.00** |

TABLE XVI

OPINION OF MERIT PAY BY RESPONDENTS

| FAVOR MERIT PAY | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 47 | 47.96 |
| No | 51 | 52.04 |
| TOTALS | 98 | 100.00 |

TABLE XVII

MAJOR CONSTRAINTS FACED
BY RESPONDENTS

| CONSTRAINTS | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Many responsibilities | 36 | 22.64 |
| Time | 33 | 20.75 |
| Paperwork | 14 | 8.81 |
| Lack of Funding | 13 | 8.18 |
| Money (Salary) | 13 | 8.18 |
| Lack of authority | 7 | 4.40 |
| Legal constraints | 4 | 2.52 |
| Other | 39 | 24.52 |
| **TOTALS** | **159** | **100.00** |

TABLE XVIII

POSITION HELD PRIOR TO SUPERVISION

| POSITION | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Classroom teacher | 43 | 40.96 |
| Athletic coach | 1 | 0.95 |
| Principalship | 35 | 33.33 |
| Ass't Principalship | 3 | 2.86 |
| Other Positions | 23 | 21.90 |
| OTHER | 105 | 100.00 |

TABLE XIX

TYPE OF SYSTEM IN WHICH RESPONDENT IS SUPERVISOR

| TYPE OF SYSTEM | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Public | 103 | 98.10 |
| Private | 2 | 1.90 |
| **TOTALS** | **105** | **100.00** |

TABLE XX

5-YEAR RETIREMENT PROJECTIONS
OF RETIREMENT

| RETIRE IN 5 YEARS | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 46 | 45.10 |
| No | 56 | 54.90 |
| **TOTALS** | **102** | **100.00** |

TABLE XXI

MEMBERSHIP HELD BY RESPONDENTS

| MEMBERSHIP | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| KASEP | 4 | 1.15 |
| KASA | 85 | 24.43 |
| KAES | 70 | 20.11 |
| KEA | 33 | 9.48 |
| KACD | 15 | 4.31 |
| KASCD | 35 | 10.06 |
| NASEP | 2 | 0.57 |
| ASCD | 41 | 11.78 |
| NEA | 35 | 10.06 |
| Other | 28 | 8.05 |
| **TOTALS** | **348** | **100.00** |

TABLE XXII

PRIMARY REASON FOR BECOMING A SUPERVISOR
AS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS

| Reason | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Income | 23 | 22.33 |
| Prestige | 2 | 1.94 |
| Improve academic performance | 22 | 21.36 |
| Make educational improvement | 25 | 24.27 |
| Springboard | 0 | 0.00 |
| Desire for leadership | 20 | 19.42 |
| Encouragement of others | 7 | 6.80 |
| Others | 4 | 3.88 |
| **TOTALS** | **103** | **100.00** |

TABLE XXIII

SECONDARY REASON FOR BECOMING A SUPERVISOR
AS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS

| REASON | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Income | 24 | 24.24 |
| Prestige | 6 | 6.06 |
| Improve academic performance | 25 | 25.26 |
| Make educational improvement | 23 | 23.23 |
| Springboard | 3 | 3.03 |
| Desire for leadership | 8 | 8.08 |
| Encouragement | 9 | 9.09 |
| Other | 1 | 1.01 |
| **TOTALS** | **99** | **100.00** |

TABLE XXIV

TERTIARY REASON FOR BECOMING A SUPERVISOR
AS REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS

| REASON | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Income | 13 | 13.98 |
| Prestige | 8 | 8.60 |
| Improve academic performance | 12 | 12.90 |
| Make educational improvement | 17 | 18.28 |
| Springboard | 10 | 10.75 |
| Desire for leadership | 20 | 21.51 |
| Encouragement by others | 13 | 13.98 |
| **TOTALS** | **93** | **100.00** |

TABLE XXV

10-YEAR PROJECTION OF RETIREMENT
BY RESPONDENTS

| RETIRE IN 10 YEARS | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 82 | 84.54 |
| No | 15 | 15.46 |
| TOTALS | 97 | 100.00 |

TABLE XXVI

NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED BY RESPONDENTS

| HOURS ON JOB | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| 60+ | 9 | 8.82 |
| 55-59 | 4 | 3.92 |
| 50-54 | 36 | 35.30 |
| 45-49 | 21 | 20.59 |
| 40-44 | 24 | 23.53 |
| 35-39 | 7 | 6.98 |
| 30-34 | 1 | 0.98 |
| TOTALS | 102 | 100.00 |

$\bar{x}$ = 45.98

TABLE XXVII

NUMBER OF STUDENTS IN
RESPONDENT'S SCHOOL DISTRICT

| ENROLLMENT | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| 10,000+ | 3 | 2.97 |
| 5,000 to 10,000 | 15 | 14.85 |
| 3,000 to 4,9999 | 20 | 19.81 |
| 2,000 to 2,900 | 27 | 26.73 |
| 1,500 to 2,000 | 16 | 15.84 |
| 1,000 to 1,499 | 11 | 10.89 |
| 500 to 999 | 9 | 8.91 |
| TOTALS | 101 | 100.00 |

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


Acheson, K. A. & Gall, M. D., (1987). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers (2nd ed.). New York: Longman, Inc.

Alfonso, R. J., Firth, G., & Neville, R. (1984). The supervisory skill mix. Educational Leadership. 41 (7), 16-18.

Alfonso, R. J., Firth, G. R. & Neville, R. F. (1981). Instructional supervision: A behavior system. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Alfonso, R. J. & Goldsberry, L. F. (1982). Colleagueship in supervision. In T. J. Sergiovanni (Ed) Supervision and teaching (pp. 90-107). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Blumberg, A. & Jonas, R. S. (1987). The teacher's control over supervision. Educational Leadership, 44 (8), 59-62.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). Clinical supervision Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Dunkleberger, G. E. (1982). Helping teachers to grow: Classroom observations -- What should principals look for? NASSP Bulletin 66 (458), 9-15.

Glickman, C. D. & Gordon, S. P. (1987). Clarifying developmental supervision. Educational Leadership, 44 (8), 64-68.

Goldsberry, L. F. (1984). The realities of clinical supervision Educational Leadership, 41 (7), 12-15.

Katz, R. L. (1955). The skills of an effective administrator. Harvard Business Review, 33-42.

Mann, F. C. (1965). Leadership and productivity. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

McGreal, T. L., Broderick, E., & Jones, J. (1984). Artifact collection. Educational Leadership, 41 (7), 20-21.

Reyes, D. J. (1986). Bringing together teacher evaluation observation, and improvement of instruction. The Clearing House, 59, 256-258.

Richardson, M. D., Cline, H. D., & Flanigan, J. L. (1988). The Kentucky principal: A self-perception. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Louisville, KY.

Richardson, M. D. (1986). A demographic profile of the Tennessee Principal. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration, Atlanta, GA.